Case 2:20-cv-00995-TLN-DMC Documen	ent 12 Filed 07/22/20 Page 1 of 2
2	
3	
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
THOMAS ZILL HANLEY,	No. 2:20-CV-00995-TLN-DMC
Plaintiff,	
v.	ORDER
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,	
Defendants.	
16	
Plaintiff Thomas Zill Hanley ("Plaintiff"), a state prisoner proceeding <i>pro se</i> , has filed this	
civil rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United	
19 States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
On June 25, 2020, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations which were	
served on Plaintiff and which contained notice to Plaintiff that any objections to the findings and	
recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. (ECF No. 10.) Plaintiff submitted	
objections to the Findings and Recommendations. (ECF No. 11.)	
This Court reviews <i>de novo</i> those portions of the proposed findings of fact to which	
objection has been made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore	
26 Business Machines, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), cert. denied, 455 U.S. 920 (1982). As	
to any portion of the proposed findings of fact to which no objection has been made, the Court	
assumes its correctness and decides the motions on the applicable law. See Orand v. United	
	1
	UNITED STATE EASTERN DIST  THOMAS ZILL HANLEY, Plaintiff, V. STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al., Defendants.  Plaintiff Thomas Zill Hanley ("Plainticivil rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S. States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. On June 25, 2020, the magistrate judge served on Plaintiff and which contained notice recommendations were to be filed within four objections to the Findings and Recommendate This Court reviews de novo those port objection has been made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) Business Machines, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th to any portion of the proposed findings of face

## Case 2:20-cv-00995-TLN-DMC Document 12 Filed 07/22/20 Page 2 of 2 States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. See Britt v. Simi Valley Unified Sch. Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983). Having carefully reviewed the entire file under the applicable legal standards, the Court finds the Findings and Recommendations to be supported by the record and by the magistrate judge's analysis. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 1. The Findings and Recommendations filed June 25, 2020 (ECF No. 10), are adopted in full; 2. Plaintiff's action is DISMISSED; and 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: July 21, 2020 Troy L. Nunley United States District Judge